

REMARKS

1.) Claim Amendments

Applicants have amended claims 8 and 46-54 to better claim the invention. Support for the amendments can be found, for example, on page 10 lines 1-7 in the present patent application. Accordingly, claims 8 and 46-54 are pending in the present patent application. Favorable reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks.

2.) Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 8 and 46-54 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,466,585 issued to Le (hereinafter "Le") in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,735,190 issued to Chuah et al. (hereinafter "Chuah"). Before addressing this rejection in detail, it should be noted that the Examiner bears the initial burden of factually supporting any *prima facie* conclusion of obviousness. *MPEP 2142*. To establish *prima facie* case of obviousness, certain criteria must be met. *First*, the prior art reference or references when combined must teach or suggest all the claim limitations. *Second*, there must be some suggestion or motivation, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the reference or to combine reference teachings. With the above requirements in mind, Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection **insofar as it applies to the amended claims** per discussion below.

Regarding the amended independent claim 8, Applicants have amended it by clarifying that the processor is configured to remove the ***"data network header information from subsequent datagrams prior to formatting if the apparatus receives a message indicating that the transmitter should begin transmitting information without data network header information."*** That is, the processor of the apparatus does not remove the data network header information from subsequent datagrams prior to formatting unless a message is received by the apparatus indicating the transmitter of the same apparatus should begin transmitting information without data network header information.

Turning to the Office Action, the Examiner indicates that the multimedia station 12 of Le for disclosing the apparatus of claim 8. *Office Action, page 2.* Assuming *arguendo* that the multimedia station 12 of Le is similar to the claimed apparatus, such multimedia station 12 does remove headers from packetized real-time media via its converter 112 but such removal is not responsive to the multimedia station's receipt of any message. *Column 9, lines 1-8.* Thus, the cited prior art references fail to teach or suggest all the limitations of claim 8.

Based on the above discussion, claim 8 should be non-obvious and patentably distinguishable over the cited prior art references.

Regarding independent claims 46-54, each of them contains at least one limitation that is similar to at least one limitation of claim 1, which is believed to be patentable. Accordingly, claims 46-54 should be non-obvious and patentably distinguishable over the cited prior art references for reasons similar to those discussed above regarding claim 1.

CONCLUSION

Claims 8 and 46-54 are presently standing in this patent application. In view of the foregoing remarks, each and every point raised in the Office Action mailed on November 29, 2005 has been addressed on the basis of the above remarks. Applicants believe all of the claims currently pending in this patent application to be in a condition for allowance. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections are respectfully requested. However, should the Examiner believe that direct contact with Applicants' attorney would advance the prosecution of the application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number given below.

Respectfully submitted,



by Dang M. Vo
Registration No. 45,183

QUALCOMM Incorporated
Attn: Patent Department
5775 Morehouse Drive
San Diego, California 92121-1714
Telephone: (858) 658-5787
Facsimile: (858) 658-2502